

TOWARD A MODEL OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OVERALL AND THE DESTINATION ATTRIBUTES SATISFACTION: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY*

Ljiljana Najev Čačija**

Davorka Mikulić***

Daša Dragnić****

Received: 13. 3. 2020

Accepted: 5. 11. 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.25.2.4>

Preliminary communication

UDC 338.48-44, 338.482:159.9

Abstract

This study presents a preliminary research towards a conceptual model of relationship between the overall and the destination attributes satisfaction. Precisely, the paper explores and classifies destination pull factors as a precondition to design a conceptual model. Therefore, the first step was to categorise destination attributes into meaningful groups of pull factors that provide greater efficiency in achieving and maintaining a desired perception of destination quality, measured by tourists' satisfaction. The exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the sample of 289 tourists visiting the town of Split (Croatia). The required prior statistical preconditions were successfully met and the principal component analysis was conducted on 20 items with Varimax rotation method. Based on the results, four pull factors were retained in the final analysis, explaining 54.760% of the variance. In the final categorisation, factor loading was above 0.4

for all four extracted factors, with reliability of measurement scales. Major findings of this study confirm that destination attributes can be grouped in a meaningful way regarding tourist satisfaction and indicate that the extracted pull factors, representing both common and unique destination attributes, have the potential to be generally applicable. The extracted factors are the primary or fundamental offer components; additional/expanded offer components; tertiary or tendency/affinity/preference offer components and specific offer components. Recommendations for further research are given, in order to explore to what extent the tourists' overall satisfaction is related to their satisfaction with destination attributes, and to expand the model with the impact of other moderating elements.

Keywords: tourists' overall satisfaction, destination attributes, pull factors, destination marketing and management

* This study is a follow up of the research, presented in the paper by Dragnić, D., Najev Čačija, Lj. & Pivčević, S. (2017). Balancing efficiency and efficacy by segmentation: the case of tourism destination Split, published in the Proceedings of the 12th International Conference "Challenges of Europe: Innovative responses for resilient growth and competitiveness", organized by the Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism Split, in May 2017.

** Ljiljana Najev Čačija, PhD, University of Split/Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Cvite Fiskovića 5, 21000 Split, Croatia, Phone: ++ 385 98 299 100; Fax: ++ 385 21 430 701, E-mail: ljiljana.najev.cacija@efst.hr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5902-511X>

*** Davorka Mikulić, PhD, University of Split/Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Cvite Fiskovića 5, 21000 Split, Croatia, Phone: ++ 385 21 430 600; Fax: ++ 385 21 430 701, E-mail: davorka.mikulic@efst.hr

**** Daša Dragnić, PhD, University of Split/Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism, Cvite Fiskovića 5, 21000 Split, Croatia, Phone: ++ 385 21 430 600; Fax: ++ 385 21 430 701, E-mail: dasa.dragnic@efst.hr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7320-3659>

1. INTRODUCTION

The constant and distinct interest in the satisfaction concept in tourism may be explained with the fact that tourists' satisfaction research provides significant implications for managing the overall performance of a destination (Krešić et al., 2013), required to achieve, inter alia, the marketing goals of tourists' repeat visits and word-of-mouth recommendations.

All aspects of the satisfaction concept, its elements and their relationships have been explored to a great extent resulting in a variety of models, theories and approaches. Numerous studies reveal interesting, yet often inconsistent results – mostly concurring with respect to general principles, but without any final consensus (Marinao, 2017) on the generally applicable and operable level for destination management.

The topics where generalisation imposes a problem, while at the same time being desirable from the aspect of destination management, are certainly the issue of destination attributes (Žabkar et al., 2010) and the issue of pull factors, respectively. Establishing a meaningful generally applicable set of destination attributes, grouped in pull factors, presenting the common, as well as the unique attributes of destination (Pike and Mason, 2011), is necessary to determine their impact on tourists' overall satisfaction and relationship with other moderating elements, thus enabling effective and efficient destination management. Therefore, the subject of this paper is to explore and classify pull factors (of destination attributes), as a first step in designing the model, which will facilitate and enhance destination management and marketing process.

The following section brings a short review of existing approaches to

conceptualising tourist satisfaction and differences in research results, specifically those regarding the pull factors, as the main interest of this research. The third section presents the results of the research, conducted on the sample of tourists visiting the town of Split in Croatia, regarding their satisfaction with 20 destination attributes. The emphasis is put on the exploratory factor analysis, as a method used to group the destination attributes into pull factors. Additionally, in the same section, the main results are discussed through comparison with the results of comparable studies. Finally, the conclusion elaborates on the implications of the results and the recommendations for further research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of satisfaction is one of the most frequently studied topics in tourism marketing research. A wide range of studies, focusing on the analysis of the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty (e.g. Agyeiwaah et al., 2016; Chan et al., 2015; Chen & Chen, 2010; Dmitrović et al., 2009; Hutchinson et al., 2009; Chi & Qu, 2008; Hui et al., 2007; Yu & Goulden, 2006; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Baker & Crompton, 2000; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000) have confirmed tourist satisfaction to be “*a strong indicator of their intentions to revisit and recommend the destination*” (Assaker et al., 2011: 892), representing the most relevant marketing goals of destination management.

The literature provides several models, theories and approaches, which vary in methodology of explaining and measuring customer satisfaction in tourism. It is a well established practice among tourism researchers (scientists and practitioners) to measure tourist satisfaction, not only with the overall evaluation of destination

experiences, but also with regard to particular destination attributes (Yu & Goulden, 2006; Kozak, 2001; Baker & Crompton, 2000). During the past three decades, numerous tourism studies have examined how destination attributes affect overall tourist satisfaction (e.g. Jensen et al., 2017; Eusébio & Luis Vieira, 2013; Denstadli & Jacobsen, 2011; Žabkar et al., 2010; Chi & Qu, 2008; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000). Various models have been offered and empirically tested, and most studies show that changes recorded in attribute performance result in changes of overall satisfaction.

Likewise, the motivation-satisfaction relationship has also been extensively investigated (Albayrak and Caber, 2018). The push-pull framework (Dann, 1977) has been often applied in tourism motivation research. The push factors are referred to, in terms of the desire to travel, while the pull factors influence the traveller's choice of destination (Wong et al., 2017: 397). According to this approach, people travel because they are *"pushed by their own internal forces and pulled by the external forces of destination attributes"* (Albayrak & Caber, 2018: 202). A number of studies have examined push and/or pull motivational factors in different destinations and different cultural settings (Wong et al., 2017; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015; Prayag & Hosany, 2014; Correia et al., 2013; Denstadli & Jacobsen, 2011; Al-Haj Mohammad & Mat Som, 2010; Devesa et al., 2010; Prayag, 2010; Sangpikul, 2008), and some in special interest tourism (Caber & Albayrak, 2016; Chen & Chen, 2015). Several studies have also examined the influence of cross-cultural differences on push and pull factors (Wong et al., 2017; Prayag & Ryan, 2011; You et al., 2000; Kozak, 2001).

Such a distinct interest in these topics can be explained with the fact that

destination attributes present the tourism offer components that need to be created and/or controlled, and that grouping them, in terms of pull factors, should facilitate destination management towards achieving, maintaining and/or improving tourist satisfaction. Given the diversity of studies, some inconsistencies in research results were to be expected. Besides some differences, regarding the impact of either attributes or pull and push factors, the studies mostly differ in grouping attributes into factors.

Yoon & Uysal (2005) have examined the causal relationships between the push and pull factors, satisfaction and destination loyalty. Evidence has been found, supporting the relationship between satisfaction and destination loyalty, and between the push factors and loyalty, while pull factors' negative effect on satisfaction has been detected. Similar model was applied by Khuong & Ha (2014), but with significantly different results, as they found the push and pull factors to positively influence the intention to revisit the destination directly, as well as indirectly, through satisfaction. Al-Haj Mohammad & Mat Som (2010) identified 25 push and 26 pull attributes and grouped them, by employing factor analysis, into eight push factors and eight pull factors ("events & activities", "easy access & affordable", "history & culture", "variety seeking", "adventure", "natural resources", "heritage sites" and "sight-seeing variety"). In his study, Prayag (2010) identified a list of 20 pull attributes, which were grouped into six factors ("facilitators", "augmented tourism product", "activities & entertainment", "climate & scenery", "cultural & natural attractions" and "novelty & image of place"), by using the factor analysis, although only two obtained factors were reliable.

Žabkar et al. (2010) confirmed the effect of destination attributes on the perceived

quality of tourist offerings, which positively relates to satisfaction and behavioural intentions. The six formative indicators (“easily reached destination”, “overall cleanliness of the destination”, “diversity of cultural/historical attractions”, “quality of accommodation”, “friendliness of the local people” and “opportunities for rest”) were used in evaluation of the model. Sangpikul (2008) and Yousefi & Marzuki (2015), in their studies of push and pull motivational factors, found three push and four pull factors (“travel arrangements & facilities”, “cultural & historical attractions”, “shopping & leisure activities” and “safety & cleanliness”). The model proposed by Eusébio & Luis Vieira (2013) confirmed that destination attributes influence overall destination satisfaction and post-visitation behavioural intentions. The results of the conducted exploratory factor analysis identified three factors – “basic services” (including price and quality of accommodation and food and drinks services), “accessibility” (including quality of transportation infrastructure, signpost and traffic congestion) and “attractions” (including cultural and natural attractions).

It is evident that generalisation poses a problem in destination research. Although there are a number of basic attributes, relevant for all destinations, many of attributes are specific to each destination and, as such, hinder generalisation (Žabkar et al., 2010: 543). And if, for comparison, measuring of perceived destination performance was limited to common attributes, this would make it difficult to identify destination’s unique attributes (Pike and Mason, 2011). However, this should not discourage research efforts in grouping of attributes into pull factors, allowing generalisation of common and specific attributes, and measurement of their relationship with tourist satisfaction, as well as of other moderating factors.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

3.1. Sample and questionnaire

The empirical research was conducted in the period from April to September 2016, on a sample of 1153 tourists, who visited the city of Split (Croatia), using a structured questionnaire and trained pollsters. The questionnaire consisted of demographic questions (gender, age, education, economic status and travel frequency), an evaluation of the overall satisfaction with Split as a tourist destination and satisfaction with destination attributes, expressed in terms of pull motivational factors. The list of 20 destination attributes was compiled by authors, based on the review of relevant empirical studies (Yiamjanya & Wongleedee, 2014; Pike & Mason, 2011; Prayag, 2010; Žabkar et al., 2010; Kozak, 2001), taking into consideration the specifics of the destination. The classification of destination attributes was previously used in research exploring the relationship between the characteristics of tourism market segments and satisfaction with destination, as well as destination’s elements (Dragnić et al., 2017). The satisfaction was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (totally dissatisfied/ying) to 5 (totally satisfied/ying). Collected data were analysed using SPSS software package.

3.2. Descriptive results and research scope

The results of the descriptive analysis of the respondents’ demographic data are presented in Table 1. The majority of tourists in the sample were female (55.6%), aged 41-60 (30.6%), of tertiary education (52.9%), of average economic status (63.0%) and travelling up to two times a year (44.8%). But it can be noted that there

was also a relatively large number of tourists representing senior citizens “61+” (20.2%), as well as tourists with higher economic status (30%) and above-average education status (postgraduate 30.7%).

Additionally, 41.0% of respondents travel three to five times per year. As the sample reflects the tourist population of Split relatively well, the results of the research can be considered relevant.

Table 1. General characteristics of tourists

	N	%
Gender		
Male	507	44.4
Female	636	55.6
TOTAL	1,143	100
Age		
16-25	277	24.5
26-40	351	30.6
41-60	278	24.6
61+	229	20.2
TOTAL	1,153	100
Education		
Primary	30	2.6
Secondary	157	13.7
Tertiary	604	52.9
Postgraduate	351	30.7
TOTAL	1,142	100
Economic status		
Lower than average	69	6.1
Average	726	63.0
Higher than average	341	30.0
TOTAL	1,153	100
Travel frequency		
1-2 per year	513	44.8
3-5 per year	469	41.0
6+ per year	162	14.2
TOTAL	1,153	100

Source: Research results

Regarding satisfaction, as the main scope of research interest, Table 2 shows overall satisfaction with Split as a tourist destination and tourists' satisfaction with 20

destination attributes (previously used by Dragnić et al., 2017), as well as averaged sum of satisfaction grades of destination attributes.

Table 2. Tourists' satisfaction descriptives

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Overall satisfaction	1,131	4.240	.8063
Satisfaction with destination attributes:			
Accommodation quality	808	3.9678	.90103
Kindness and affability of service provider	810	3.9975	.91140
Richness of cultural-historic heritage	908	4.4218	.81025
Variety of cultural contents	769	4.0026	.86150
Quality of gastronomic offer	781	3.8899	.90052
Authenticity of souvenirs, crafts...	653	3.3859	.97101
Shopping possibilities	672	3.6205	.98137
Variety of fun content for youth	487	3.4600	1.00714
Variety of other fun content	534	3.5974	.92133
Orderliness of beaches	647	3.7960	.98209
Variety of sports-recreational contents	480	3.4042	.96233
Availability of medical, wellness & beauty services	406	3.2956	.91156
Corresponding value for money	784	3.7768	.89124
Traffic connectedness of destination	695	3.7396	1.06006
Availability of other services	626	3.8291	.97218
Cleanness of the city, orderliness of public surfaces...	783	4.0332	.88692
The offer in destination surroundings is interesting	661	4.1377	.85144
Hospitality of local citizens	787	4.0928	.90393
Atmosphere and spirit of destination	824	4.3447	.78420
Availability of information in destination	653	3.8070	.94778
Average summated satisfaction grade of destination attributes		3.830	
Valid N (listwise)	284		

Source: Research results

The overall satisfaction score was 4.24, whilst the satisfaction grades of destination attributes ranged from 3.29 to 4.42, with the average sum of destination satisfaction grade attributes equal to 3.83. Thus, the overall satisfaction grade is noticeably higher than most of the individual destination attributes' satisfaction grades, with the same applying to their average grade sum. Only two attributes have a higher satisfaction grade than the overall satisfaction

– 'Richness of cultural-historic heritage' and 'Atmosphere and spirit of destination'.

These results, like in many studies of similar scope (e.g. Jensen et al., 2017; Eusébio & Luis Vieira, 2013; Chi & Qu, 2008; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000), raise the question to what extent the overall satisfaction grade is related to the satisfaction grade of destination attributes in a perspective of tourist satisfaction management. Though scientists and practitioners acknowledge that tourists'

overall satisfaction and destination attributes' satisfaction differ, but are related in a way that the latter leads to the former, the generally accepted and applicable answer to the question has not been defined.

To be able to answer this question, authors' first step was to categorise destination attributes into meaningful groups of pull factors that provide greater efficiency in managing a destination towards achieving and maintaining a desired perception of quality, measured by tourists' satisfaction. Thus, in this preliminary study, the authors explore the relationships among destination attributes regarding tourist satisfaction, with the aim of grouping them accordingly, not only to decrease the number of elements to be managed, but to propose the generally applicable groups of pull factors.

3.3. EFA research findings and discussion

To achieve the research purpose, the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted, in order to group the destination attributes into pull factors that might better explain the relationship with the overall tourist satisfaction.

Prior to factor analysis, the required tests were performed. No significant outliers were detected, the data were found normally distributed (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, sig 0.000 for all elements, shown in Table 3) and sample size sufficient. However, only the data containing the grades of all destination attributes' satisfaction (N=289) were considered for further analysis.

Table 3. Tests of normality for destination attributes' satisfaction

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov test		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Accommodation quality	.246	289	.000
Kindness and affability of service provider	.255	289	.000
Richness of cultural-historic heritage	.317	289	.000
Variety of cultural contents	.221	289	.000
Quality of gastronomic offer	.233	289	.000
Authenticity of souvenirs, crafts...	.214	289	.000
Shopping possibilities	.199	289	.000
Variety of fun content for youth	.218	289	.000
Variety of other fun content	.211	289	.000
Orderliness of beaches	.250	289	.000
Variety of sports-recreational contents	.236	289	.000
Availability of medical, wellness & beauty services	.241	289	.000
Corresponding value for money	.250	289	.000
Traffic connectedness of destination	.219	289	.000
Availability of other services	.236	289	.000
Cleanness of the city, orderliness of public surfaces...	.211	289	.000
The offer in destination surroundings is interesting	.256	289	.000
Hospitality of local citizens	.235	289	.000
Atmosphere and spirit of destination	.215	289	.000
Availability of information in destination	.285	289	.000
Accommodation quality	.244	289	.000

Source: Research results

In order to determine the underlying dimension of the tourist satisfaction with the destination attributes, EFA was conducted on a sub-sample of 289 respondents (data with grades of all destination attributes' satisfaction), which with 14.45 cases per attribute satisfied the rule of thumb of min. 10 to 15 cases per variable (Field, 2009). Thus, 20 items were analysed using principal component analysis and Varimax rotation

method. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is $KMO = 0.881$ and all KMO values for individual items are above the acceptable limit of 0.5 (Field, 2009), with the exception of one item (with $KMO = 0.482$, very near the threshold of 0.5). Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates that correlations between items are sufficiently strong. The results of KMO and Bartlett's test are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.881
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2065.077
	Df	190
	Sig.	.000

Source: Research results

An initial analysis was run with five factors, with eigenvalues over 1 (Kaiser criterion) and in combination explained 58.754% of the variance, but the scree plot showed inflexions that justify the four factors

option. So, based on the sample size and the scree plot, four pull factors were retained in final analysis, explaining 54.760% of the variance (Table 5).

Table 5. Total variance explained for final solution

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	6.684	33.418	33.418	6.684	33.418	33.418	3.522	17.608	17.608
2	1.822	9.110	42.528	1.822	9.110	42.528	2.806	14.031	31.639
3	1.331	6.653	49.182	1.331	6.653	49.182	2.456	12.279	43.918
4	1.116	5.578	54.760	1.116	5.578	54.760	2.168	10.842	54.760
5	.976	4.879	59.639						
6	.902	4.510	64.149						
7	.824	4.119	68.269						
8	.740	3.699	71.968						
9	.639	3.194	75.162						
10	.622	3.112	78.274						
11	.593	2.965	81.239						
12	.573	2.864	84.103						
13	.558	2.790	86.893						
14	.497	2.487	89.380						
15	.486	2.432	91.812						

16	.373	1.864	93.677						
17	.363	1.816	95.493						
18	.338	1.688	97.181						
19	.313	1.565	98.747						
20	.251	1.253	100.000						

Source: Research results

The average of the communalities is 0.54 ($10.952/20 = 0.5476$), which is acceptable for this sample size and number of items (Table 6.).

Table 6. Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Accommodation quality	1.000	.414
Kindness and affability of service provider	1.000	.489
Richness of cultural-historic heritage	1.000	.763
Variety of cultural contents	1.000	.753
Quality of gastronomic offer	1.000	.446
Authenticity of souvenirs, crafts...	1.000	.477
Shopping possibilities	1.000	.595
Variety of fun content for youth	1.000	.709
Variety of other fun content	1.000	.699
Orderliness of beaches	1.000	.392
Variety of sports-recreational contents	1.000	.484
Availability of medical, wellness & beauty services	1.000	.492
Corresponding value for money	1.000	.470
Traffic connectedness of destination	1.000	.601
Availability of other services	1.000	.623
Cleanness of the city, orderliness of public surfaces...	1.000	.427
The offer in destination surroundings is interesting	1.000	.521
Hospitality of local citizens	1.000	.622
Atmosphere and spirit of destination	1.000	.522
Availability of information in destination	1.000	.452
Total communalities extraction: 10.952		
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

Source: Research results

As demonstrated by Table 5, four pull factors have been extracted, with eigenvalues 6.684 for factor 1; 1.822 for factor

2; 1.331 for factor 3 and 1.116 for factor 4. Rotated solution for proposed four factors with their factor loading is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Rotated component matrix of final solution

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Hospitality of local citizens	.733			
Kindness and affability of service provider	.671			
Atmosphere and spirit of destination	.621			
Cleanness of the city, orderliness of public surfaces...	.598			
Accommodation quality	.591			
Corresponding value for money	.462	.357		.302
Shopping possibilities		.695		
Authenticity of souvenirs, crafts...		.622		
Traffic connectedness of destination	.465	.618		
Availability of other services	.509	.585		
Availability of medical, wellness & beauty services		.569	.343	
Availability of information in destination	.452	.496		
Variety of fun content for youth			.773	
Variety of other fun content			.769	
Orderliness of beaches	.378		.518	
Variety of sports-recreational contents		.373	.517	
The offer in destination surroundings is interesting	.360		.435	.434
Quality of gastronomic offer	.342		.419	.321
Richness of cultural-historic heritage				.845
Variety of cultural contents				.839

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

Source: Research results

The results in Table 7 show that the EFA procedure has extracted four pull factors. Since this study is a preliminary research, aimed toward formulating a conceptual model of relationship between the overall and the destination attributes satisfaction, relatively liberal rules of thumb for factor loading were applied. Even though the rotated component matrix shows factor loadings higher than 0.3, in the final categorisation, all factor loadings are above 0.4. In cases where the same component could be categorised in more than a single factor, researchers used prior knowledge and meaningfulness of the study results and implications of categorisation. Along this line of reasoning, the categorisation of 'Traffic

connectedness', 'Availability of other services', 'Availability of information in destination' and 'The interesting offer in destination surroundings' coincided with the highest factor loading criterion.

Furthermore, the characteristics of attributes that cluster on the same pull factor, suggest that Factor 1 represents the primary or basic offer components, Factor 2 the secondary or additional/expanded offer components, Factor 3 tertiary or tendency/affinity/preference (TAP) offer components. Taking into consideration that 'history & culture' was the most common association related to Split as tourist destination (Pivčević et al., 2017), the categorisation of history and

culture offer components in Factor 4 may indicate that this factor represents the specific offer components, i.e. those related to uniqueness or “trade mark” of a destination. Thus, these four pull factors (Table 8) offer

a way to identify, measure, compare and manage the common, as well as the unique perception of the quality of destination attributes, measured with tourist satisfaction.

Table 8. Pull factors regarding tourist satisfaction with destination attributes

Factor	Name	Brief explanation
Factor 1	MUST HAVE	primary or basic tourist offer components
Factor 2	UPGRADE	secondary or additional/expanded tourist offer components
Factor 3	TAP	tertiary or tendency/affinity/preference tourist offer components
Factor 4	SPECIFIC	specific or unique/ “trade mark” tourist offer components (<i>in this case: ‘history & culture’</i>)

Source: Research results

To confirm the EFA findings, reliability of measurement scales was conducted and confirmed, as Cronbach’s Alfa was above

0.7 for the whole scale, as well as for each of the four factors (Table 9).

Table 9. Reliability statistics for extracted pull factors

Factor	Name	No. of components	Cronbach’s Alpha
Factor 1	MUST HAVE	6	0.885
Factor 2	UPGRADE	6	0.767
Factor 3	TAP	6	0.746
Factor 4	SPECIFIC	2	0.723

Source: Research results

Comparing these pull factors to the findings of the previously mentioned studies, some similarities and differences can be noticed. The number of included destination attributes varies from 9 to 33 and, in spite of similarity in basic attributes, their scope differs. The study of Eusébio and Vieira (2013), which included 9 destination attributes, shows scarcity of the “soft” ones. In the studies with numerous attributes, scope differs less (Sangpikul, 2008; Prayag, 2010; Chi & Qu, 2008), though differences, those referring to specifics of destination in particular (Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015; Al-Haj Mohammad & Mat Som, 2010), can be noticed. Comparing the

sets of pull factors, regardless of the difference in number (from 3 to 8) and their names, many similarities can be found, particularly in grouping common destination attributes. But, unlike previously extracted pull factors, the presented set offers the way to generalise specific destination attributes and the flexibility needed, due to variety of destinations, as well as of tourists’ motives and preferences. So, the factor 3 (TAP- tendency/ affinity/preference tourist offer components) and the factor 4 (specific or unique/“trade mark” tourist offer components) can be considered as the main advantage and contribution of the presented set of pull factors.

4. CONCLUSION

Regardless of some similarities with the pull factors extracted in previous research, it can be concluded that the new set of pull factors, representing destination attributes, i.e. tourist offer components, is presented as a starting point in evaluation of the relationship between the overall and destination attributes' satisfaction. Major findings confirm that destination attributes can be grouped in a meaningful way with the purpose to reveal subtle preference changes or experienced dissatisfaction among tourists so as to improve the final performance – overall satisfaction with a destination. In addition, extracted pull factors, representing common and unique destinations' attributes, have the potential to be generally applicable.

These findings could serve as a stimulus for putting an additional research effort in grouping the destinations' attributes into pull factors which can enable generalisation of common, as well as of specific attributes and the measurement of their relationship with tourist satisfaction, as well as of other moderating factors, accordingly. Additionally, these findings would enhance understanding of the role of various destination attributes in achieving tourist satisfaction, and that, in turn, could facilitate and improve destination management and marketing processes and results. As a research limitation, a relatively small sample of tourists and a single destination and its attributes should be noted. Further research should include larger samples and a number of diverse destinations, in order to test the potential of generalisation of the extracted pull factors, thus, leading to the formulation of the conceptual model of the relationship between the overall and destination attributes' satisfaction. Additionally, further research should confirm and improve findings, not only to answer the question to

what extent the overall satisfaction grade is related to the satisfaction grade of destination attributes, but to expand the model with the impact of push factors and/or other moderating elements.

References

1. Agyeiwaah, E., Adongo, R., Dimache, A. & Wondirad, A. (2016). Make a customer, not a sale: Tourist satisfaction in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 57, pp. 68-79.
2. Albayrak, T. & Caber, M. (2018). Examining the relationship between tourist motivation and satisfaction by two competing methods. *Tourism Management* 69, pp. 201–213.
3. Al-Haj Mohammad, B.A.M. & Mat Som, A.P. (2010). An Analysis of Push and Pull Travel Motivations of Foreign Tourists to Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (12), pp. 41-50
4. Assaker, G., Vincenzo Esposito Vinzi, V. & O'Connor P. (2011). Examining the effect of novelty seeking, satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern: A two factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism Management*, 32, pp. 890-901.
5. Baker, D.A. & Crompton, J.L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27 (3), pp. 785-804.
6. Caber, M., & Albayrak, T. (2016). Push or pull? Identifying rock climbing tourists' motivations. *Tourism Management*, 55, pp. 74–84.
7. Chan, A., Hsu, C.H.C. & Baum, T. (2015). The Impact of Tour Service Performance on Tourist Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions: A Study of Chinese Tourists in Hong Kong,

- Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32 (1-2), pp. 18-33.
8. Chen, C. & Chen, F. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), pp.29-35.
 9. Chi, C.G.-Q. & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, 29 (4), pp. 624-636.
 10. Correia, A., Kozak, M. & Ferradeira, J. (2013). From tourist motivations to tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(4), pp. 411-424.
 11. Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4 (4), pp. 184-194.
 12. Denstadli, J.M. & Jacobsen, J.K.S. (2011). The long and winding roads: Perceived quality of scenic tourism routes *Tourism Management*, 32, pp. 780-789
 13. Devesa, M., Laguna, M. & Palacios, A. (2010). The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, pp. 547-552.
 14. Dmitrović, T., Knežević Cvelbar, Lj., Kolar, T., Makovec Brenčič, M., Ograjenšek, M. & Žabkar, V. (2009). Conceptualizing tourist satisfaction at the destination level. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 3 (2), pp. 116-126.
 15. Dragnić, D., Najev Čačija, Lj. & Pivčević, S. (2017). Balancing efficiency and efficacy by segmentation: the case of tourism destination Split. In *Challenges of Europe: International Conference Proceedings*, Sveučilište u Splitu, Ekonomski fakultet, Split. pp. 451-469.
 16. Eusébio, C. & Luís Vieira, A.L. (2013). Destination Attributes' Evaluation, Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions: a Structural Modelling Approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 15, pp. 66-80.
 17. Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: (and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll)*. Los Angeles [i.e. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
 18. Hui, T.K., Wan, D. & Ho, A. (2007). Tourists' satisfaction, recommendation and revisiting Singapore. *Tourism Management*, 28 (4), pp. 965-975.
 19. Hutchinson, J., Lai, F. & Wang, Y. (2009). Understanding the relationships of quality, value, equity, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions among golf travelers. *Tourism Management*, 30 (2), pp. 298-308.
 20. Jensen, Ø., Li, Y. & Uysal, M. (2017). Visitors' satisfaction at managed tourist attractions in Northern Norway: Do on-site factors matter? *Tourism Management*, 63, pp. 277-286.
 21. Khuong, M. N. & Ha, H.T.T. (2014). The Influences of Push and Pull Factors on the International Leisure Tourists' Return Intention to Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam - A Mediation Analysis of Destination Satisfaction. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 5 (6), pp. 490-496.
 22. Kozak, M. & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an offseason holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38 (3), pp. 260-269.

23. Kozak, M. (2001). "Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities", *Tourism Management*, 22 (4), pp. 391-401.
24. Krešić, D., Mikulić, J. & Miličević, K. (2013). The Factor Structure of Tourist Satisfaction at Pilgrimage Destinations: the Case of Medjugorje. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, pp. 484-494.
25. Marinao, E. (2017). Determinants of Satisfaction with the Tourist Destination, in Butowski L., (ed.) *Mobilities, Tourism and Travel Behavior - Contexts and Boundaries*, IntechOpen, available: [https://www.intechopen.com/books/mobilities-tourism-and-travel-behavior-con](https://www.intechopen.com/books/mobilities-tourism-and-travel-behavior-contexts-and-boundaries/)
26. [texts-and-boundaries/](#) (accessed on 15.09.2019)
27. Pike, S. & Mason, R. (2011). Destination competitiveness through the lens of brand positioning, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2), pp. 169-182
28. Pivčević, S., Dragnić, D., Mikulić, D., Najev Čačija, Lj. & Petrić, L. (2017). Strateški marketinški plan destinacije Split 2017-2022, Tourist Board of Split, available: <https://visitsplit.com/hr/2160/dokumenti> (accessed on 20.11.2019.)
29. Prayag, G. (2010). Images as pull factors of a tourism destination: A factor-cluster segmentation analysis. *Tourism Analysis*, 15, pp. 213-226.
30. Prayag, G. & Ryan, C. (2011) The relationship between the 'push' and 'pull' factors of a tourist destination: the role of nationality – an analytical qualitative research approach, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), pp. 121-143.
31. Prayag, G. & Hosany, S. (2014) When Middle East meets West: Understanding the motives and perceptions of young tourists from United Arab Emirates. *Tourism Management*, 40, pp. 35-45.
32. Sangpikul, A. (2008). A factor-cluster analysis of tourist motivations: A case of U.S. senior travelers. *Tourism*, 56 (1) pp. 23-40.
33. Yiamjanya, S. & Wongleedee, K. (2014). International tourists' travel motivation by push-pull factors and the decision making for selecting Thailand as destination choice. *International Journal of Social, Education, Economics and Management Engineering*, 8(5), 1326-1331.
34. Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26 (1), pp. 45-56.
35. Yu, L. & Goulden, M. (2006). A comparative analysis of international tourists' satisfaction in Mongolia. *Tourism Management* 27, pp. 1331-1342.
36. You, X., O'Leary, J., Morrison, A. & Hong, G.-S. (2000) A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Travel Push and Pull Factors, *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1 (2), pp. 1-26.
37. Yousefi, M. & Marzuki, A. (2015) An Analysis of Push and Pull Motivational Factors of International Tourists to Penang, Malaysia, *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 16 (1), pp. 40-56.
38. Wong, B.K.M., Musa, G. & Taha, A. (2017). Malaysia my second home: The influence of push and pull

- motivations on satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 61, pp. 394-410.
39. Žabkar, V., Makovec Brenčič, M. & Dmitrović, T. (2010). Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level. *Tourism Management*. 31, pp. 537–546.

PREMA RAZVOJU MODELA ODNOSA IZMEĐU UKUPNOG I ZADOVOLJSTVA ATRIBUTIMA DESTINACIJE: PRELIMINARNA STUDIJA

Sažetak

U ovoj se studiji predstavlja preliminarno istraživanje, usmjereno prema razvoju konceptualnog modela odnosa između ukupnog i zadovoljstva atributima destinacije. Točnije rečeno, u radu se ispituju i klasificiraju čimbenici privlačenja od strane destinacije, kao pretpostavka za dizajniranje konceptualnog istraživačkog modela. Stoga je, kao prvi istraživački korak, provedena kategorizacija atributa destinacije u logične skupine čimbenika privlačenja, koji omogućavaju veću učinkovitost postizanja i održavanja željene razine kvalitete destinacije, mjerene pomoću zadovoljstva turista. Na uzorku od 289 turistističkih posjetitelja grada Splita provedena je eksploratorna faktorska analiza (EFA). Uz zadovoljavanje statističkih preduvjeta, analiza glavnih komponenti, uz Varimax rotaciju, provedena je na 20 čestica. Na temelju dobivenih rezultata, zadržana su četiri faktora privlačenja, koji objašnjavaju 54,76% varijance. U završnom koraku, faktorska opterećenja su iznosila više od 0,4 za sve identificirane faktore s pouzdanim mjernim ljestvicama. Najvažniji zaključci ove studije potvrđuju da se atributi destinacije mogu grupirati na smislen način, korištenjem zadovoljstva turista kao temelja grupiranja, kao i da identificirani čimbenici privlačenja – kako posebna, tako i opća obilježja destinacije – imaju potencijal za generalizaciju. Identificirani faktori su: primarne/temeljne, dodatne/proširene i tercijarne (povezane s individualnim ukusima te preferencijama), kao i specifične komponente ponude. Identificiraju se preporuke za buduća istraživanja, kako bi se utvrdilo do koje mjere je ukupno zadovoljstvo turista povezano s njihovim zadovoljstvom obilježjima destinacije te proširio model s ostalim elementima, koji imaju posrednički utjecaj.

Ključne riječi: *ukupno zadovoljstvo turista, obilježja destinacije, čimbenici privlačenja, marketing i menadžment destinacije*